



Forum Summary: Funding

February 26, 2009

Forum No. 2

Attendees: Craig Partridge (Facilitator), Mark Mauren, Margaret Barrette, Robert, Dengel, Jana Greer, Gerry Hodge, Arlene Brooks, Paul Dahmer, Jim Eychaner (in place of Kaleen Cottingham), Will Chin, Jeff Chapman, Elizabeth Lunney, Dave Lipinski
Sustainable Recreation Work Group participants attended via conference call and GoToMeeting®
Public participants listened via conference call

Amended Agenda:

Welcome and meeting objectives
Explanation of the “voting” assignment
Complete voting assignment
Brief Announcements
Review of information requested by members
Presentation of “voting” results
Initial selection of most preferred methods
Feedback and Wrap up

Voting Exercise Clarification –

Craig explained that the intent of the voting assignment was to reduce the population of funding ideas to a smaller group from which the members could have a discussion on options. The goal of the discussion forum was to make preliminary recommendations that would be brought to the full work group for their deliberation in May.

- Concern was expressed that some rankings could fluctuate based on external factors (i.e. sponsorship not sustainable in poor economic times)

Announcements

- Sharepoint is up and running although understanding that members are having issues and DNR is looking into it and will share information as it becomes available
- Discussion Forum on “Environmental Issues” will begin in the spring
- Discussion Forum “Safety and Liability” will likely begin in the spring
- Members should be looking for scheduling information for the upcoming full Work Group meeting (likely the second or third week of May)



Forum Summary: Funding

February 26, 2009

Forum No. 2

Review of information requested by members

Cost Estimates – Craig and Mark

- Discussion of planning costs and needs relating to the 74 landscapes across the state that the public is actively utilizing.
- Would like an analytical assessment of what type of revenue is possible from the proposed methods

Mutli-State Survey of funding options - Robert

- Large spectrum exists – no funding Alaska to large funding in PA and Missouri
- Oregon has solid funding from timber revenue from State Forests
- Wisconsin also has solid funding source from state property tax (\$0.16 for every \$1000 of assessed value)
- Attempt made to look exclusively at agencies or parts of agencies that manage state forest lands.

Member comments –

- Wisconsin does have several types of fees and uses the state park system to collect those fees, however the \$20 fee does not apply to hikers and ORVs, but does apply to bikes, horses, in-line skaters.
- It was pointed out that the revenue generated by the states doesn't meet the need to accomplish one plan, however the revenue could provide maintenance and/or operation costs over time

Review of the 2002 Endowment Proposal – Craig

- Original proposal received hearings but was not successful perhaps because of concern over DNR holding commercial lands
- Difference between state general obligation bonds and revenue bonds (which are not paid back out of general revenue, but rather paid back from revenue generated by the lands)
- i.e., some of the revenue from these lands to retire the debt, and wouldn't be competing with the demands on general obligations

“Voting” results –

Results indicated a single favorite (Dedicated Revenue), a single least favorite (Sponsorships), and three in the middle (tax, fees, and other)

Agreement that we didn't need to further define the priority issues

Some members considered the following in their ranking:

- Political feasibility
- How much funding could really be generated



Forum Summary: Funding

February 26, 2009

Forum No. 2

- How equitable in terms of who would be paying

Identification of preferred methods in each category



Forum Summary: Funding

February 26, 2009

Forum No. 2

Process Ideas and Feedback

- Indication that members are having a difficult time getting signed on to sharepoint
- DNR should be clear in e-mail subject heading if a response is needed, or if it contains informational material

Next Steps

DNR will provide a matrix to members and ask members complete indicating preferences as well as indicate strong concerns for the particular methods. This work should be returned to DNR. We are shooting for a week turn-around so staff can develop additional information (fiscal impacts, operational issues, etc)

Next meeting

The next forum discussion on access will be scheduled for late March
Begin and complete detailed discussion of top funding items